

Cannabis

Global Histories

Edited by Lucas Richert and James H. Mills

**The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England**

© 2021 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

This book was set in Stone Serif and Stone Sans by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Mills, Jim, editor. | Richert, Lucas, 1979- editor.

Title: Cannabis : global histories / edited by Jim Mills and Lucas Richert.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2021] |

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2020047119 | ISBN 9780262045209 (Paperback)

Subjects: LCSH: Cannabis—History. | Cannabis—Social aspects.

Classification: LCC HV5822.C3 C358 2021 | DDC 362.29/56109—dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2020047119>

Introduction Breaking News: “Weed Kills Coronavirus”

James H. Mills and Lucas Richert

Cannabis is a magic plant. Till mid-80s it was sold by Govt. Because of Rajiv Gandhi and western Pharma companies it got bad name. Make cannabis legal.

—Alt News, “Fact Check: Weed Kills Coronavirus? Vivek Agnihotri Shares Scientific Misinformation via Meme”

On February 8, 2020, Indian filmmaker and author Vivek Agnihotri tweeted a screenshot with the headline “Weed Kills Coronavirus,” which looked as if it had been taken from a news broadcast. He added the commentary above, suggesting the magical properties of cannabis and the need for reform in cannabis laws.¹ Inspired by this news, others joined in, and one tweeter agreed, adding, “Solution to a lot of world’s problems lie in India. But you can’t find them as long as you ridicule our ancient wisdom [*sic*].” As it turned out, Agnihotri had not checked his sources before passing on the screenshot. It was not taken from a news channel but was, in fact, a meme that originated on a website called dopl3r.com.²

The website proclaimed that, “We are a proudly mexican enterprise and dopl3r wishes to share the joy, the sense of humor and the entertainment with all the people around the world.”³ A creator and sharer of memes, the website enables users to import an illustration and a message into a template and then click a button to generate a new meme. In this case, someone had simply cut and pasted into a TV broadcast template a stock image of a spoonful of cannabis leaves and added the headline together with a strapline insisting: “Scientists are shocked to discover that weed kills coronavirus.”⁴ The inventor of the meme, and her or his intentions, have proven to be impossible to trace. However, the idea that cannabis could have potential as a treatment for coronavirus had already been in

circulation on social media the previous month. The US-based cannabis activist Peter Jonathan Hanna, for instance, tweeted on January 27, 2020:

The coronavirus is probably going to be the worst deadly virus in modern history.

Cannabis has several dozen antiviral medicines in it and all the other hundreds of medicines in cannabis will greatly boost your immune system and protect you from this virus. Prepare!⁵

Later that day Hanna expanded his claims even further, asserting that, “Orally consuming cannabis can give you immunity from Coronavirus AND cannabis can cure your Coronavirus.”⁶ Such statements on social media were becoming significant enough that, by the end of January, the *Washington Post* reported, “It’s these particularly harmful nuggets of deception flagged by leading health authorities that Facebook is vowing to scrub from its platform.”⁷

Back in India, the *Deccan Herald* was one of the country’s first newspapers to report the insubstantial basis for Agnihotri’s tweet under the headline: “Fact Check: Weed Kills Coronavirus? Vivek Agnihotri Shares Scientific Misinformation via Meme on February 10.”⁸ The story had actually been challenged on the same day that he posted his tweet on the Indian-based website Latestly, “a leading Information Portal for the Millennials of today . . . providing information on the trend related stories.”⁹ The Indian film director had, in other words, been duped by an anonymous hoaxer, via a Mexican meme service, at a time when there was a wave of similar stories emanating from the United States on a global social media platform.

This is a very twenty-first-century story, with memes, social media hoaxes, fact-checkers, and activists all features of a new media landscape that has only recently become familiar. At first sight, it may appear odd to start a volume of essays about histories of cannabis around the world with a tale so contemporary. While writing this introduction, the coronavirus pandemic continues to kill, and its authors are in various states of lockdown. These are certainly strange and occasionally very sad days, with evidence-based policy and ideas struggling against misinformation and myths. Yet, the Agnihotri story serves as the perfect place to start: the questions raised by it can only be answered with reference to global histories of cannabis.

The first of these questions is: How has there come to be such a lively interest in cannabis in so many places around the world? After all, the episode above includes a virus that spread from its point of origin in China, cannabis activists in the United States, a Mexican website, an Indian film

director, as well as a multinational corporation. Related to the above question is another: In so many different places, why is cannabis thought to have the potential to treat even the most unfamiliar of fatal diseases? A brief outline of the global history of cannabis below indicates that in many places, and at many times, cannabis medicines have been dismissed as dangerous, useless, or obsolete, meaning the suggestion that it may be the cure for a coronavirus that surfaced around the world needs to be explained.

Finally, Agnihotri’s original post points to the question of just who exactly globalized cannabis. He seems to think that Western pharmaceutical companies meddled in India back in the 1980s and that their agendas altered Indian policies and attitudes. But this is to ignore the role of other agencies with an international or even global reach. The following introduction, and the chapters in the volume, trace the groups and bodies that sought to establish common understandings of the plant—as well as the cannabis products that have transcended national or cultural boundaries.

The History of Histories of Cannabis

Efforts to establish the history of cannabis have an extensive past. When nineteenth-century writers in the West began to investigate its properties and potential, they routinely started with statements like: “The Hemp plant has been cultivated in Bengal from time immemorial for the purpose of intoxication,” or “Cannabis has been cultivated in the plains of Egypt for centuries, but they do not draw hemp from it as in Europe; instead the Arabs produce a preparation called *kif* from which they procure the annihilation of thinking and reason and a voluptuous stupor.”¹⁰ Given the often colorful content of these historical accounts, it is difficult to take them too seriously.¹¹

More serious were the efforts of academics to research histories of cannabis that appeared in the wake of the emergence of new consumers and controls in the United States in the 1960s. Vera Rubin explicitly acknowledged the link in the introduction to *Cannabis and Culture* (1975), stating: “Public concern about the youth ‘drug culture,’ particularly in Western societies, has stimulated unprecedented support for research on various drugs, including cannabis.” The book, a collection of essays much like this one, was the outcome of a conference on Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Cannabis, convened in Chicago in 1973, which was funded by the Center for the Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse, National Institute of Mental

Health. While anthropologists were the driving force behind the project, the volume contained some historical essays. Significantly, Rubin's introduction adopted what would now be considered a global perspective, in seeking to describe the "ethnobotanic diffusion" of cannabis across places, cultures, and time. The language and framing devices used are very much of the period:

Two major cultural complexes appear to have encompassed use of the plant over time—a traditional folk stream which reveals remarkable continuity and a contemporary, more circumscribed configuration.¹²

In her account, the "folk stream" had endured since ancient times and could be described as "the ganja complex," considering the plant was mainly used around the world by the lower social classes for everything from clothing to cordage, food to medicine, and "general use as a euphoriant and symbol of fellowship." In contrast to this long, gradual process, Rubin asserted that there was

The second current, going back only about a century to the formation of the Club des Hachichins in Paris, [which] is linked mainly to the search for psychedelic experiences. Diffused in the mid-twentieth century to the United States and Canada and Western-oriented youth in traditional cultures, it generally is an upper- and middle-class social phenomenon, limited to the psychedelic function and may be called the "marihuana complex."¹³

While her account of the global spread of cannabis was largely descriptive, it surpassed what other writers offered on the plant and its products in the 1970s and 1980s. For example, Ernest Abel's *Marihuana: The First Twelve Thousand Years* (1980) ranged widely across the world, and included China, the Middle East, southern Africa, and India in his account. While less interested in what drove its diffusion and more concerned with showing how unjust and confused the position was in contemporary America when viewed in the long history of human contact with the plant, the book provides glimpses of global processes. But such generalizations are light on detail and context.¹⁴ Jack Herer's *The Emperor Has No Clothes* (1985) similarly ranged widely across periods and continents in an effort to discredit the US government's position on the plant, but his oversimplifications were as bereft of evidence as they were heavy on hyperbole:

According to virtually every anthropologist and university in the world, marijuana was also used in most of our religions and cults as one of the seven or so

most widely used mood-, mind- or pain-altering drugs when taken as psychotropic, psychedelic (mind-manifesting or -expanding) sacraments.¹⁵

A lot of books in this vein have followed.¹⁶

Academic interest in cannabis began to revive in the 1990s and found a place in the generation of path-breaking historical accounts of drug control regimes and markets for intoxicating medicines that were published around the turn of the century. Virginia Berridge's *Opium and the People* (1999) included a chapter on cocaine and cannabis in the UK in the nineteenth century with an overview of the history of the medical and scientific interest that the latter briefly excited there.¹⁷ David Musto and Pamela Korsmeyer (1999; 2002), David Courtwright (2002), and Carolyn Acker (2002) asked questions about cannabis and drug control more broadly, although they diverged in their approaches to answering them. Courtwright adopted a transnational approach stretching back centuries, while Acker and Musto focused on American institutions and policy in the twentieth century.¹⁸ William B. McAllister's account of the emergence of the international drugs regulatory system over the course of the twentieth century included traces of cannabis in a story dominated by the politics of opium.¹⁹

Perhaps in response to the haphazard continent-hopping of those like Abel and Herer, or to the generation of academic studies that simply saw cannabis as part of a wider story about intoxicating substances, a new wave of cannabis historians took the plant and its preparations as their focus in a range of national contexts. For example, *Cannabis Britannica* (2003) was the result of contemporary cannabis debates in the UK, and it was an attempt to explain how the rules and regulations that were being reconsidered by the authorities came about in the first place. While it identified some of the wider global phenomena shaping the British story, such as the nation's colonial past and its role in the emergence of the international drugs regulatory system, the book's chief concern was with the national context. Suzanne Taylor's 2010 thesis similarly focused on the British context to explore how cannabis was reimagined as a medicine in the UK after 1973, following decades of neglect in scientific and policy circles of its potential as a source of therapeutic substances.²⁰

The national context was also central to many of the other studies in this new wave. *Marijuana Australiana* by John Jiggins (2004) argued that in the twentieth century, cannabis in Australia became entangled in coercive

government efforts at social control.²¹ Marcel Martel's *Not This Time: Canadians, Public Policy, and the Marijuana Question, 1961–1975* (2006) and Catherine Carstairs, *Jailed for Possession: Illegal Drug Use, Regulation and Power in Canada, 1920–1961* (2006) provided plenty of original archival research to cover the history there, and the recent volume of papers by Andrew Potter and Daniel Weinstock, *High Time: The Legalization and Regulation of Cannabis in Canada* (2019), has captured research since.²² Together, these works trace the rise and fall and rise of Canadian cannabis, showcasing prohibitionist impulses, social activism, and how the Supreme Court underpinned medicalization in 2001—factors that led to Canada becoming the first Group of Seven (G7) country to federally legalize cannabis consumption. *Cannabis Nation* (2012) completed the UK story begun in *Cannabis Britannica* and identified the paradox that a control regime there predated any consumers, as well as tracing the implications of this into the twenty-first century.

In 2014, the focus shifted to Latin America with the publication of *Home Grown: Marijuana and the Origins of Mexico's War on Drugs* by Isaac Campos.²³ This study traced the emergence of a distinctly Mexican concern with cannabis consumption, which dated back to the nineteenth century and tackled some well-worn myths about US influence there. Lina Britto's *Marijuana Boom: The Rise and Fall of Colombia's First Drug Paradise* (2020) similarly focused on a Latin American country to show that cannabis preceded cocaine as an export commodity there. Academics have also taken on the task of producing balanced and detailed accounts of the history of cannabis products in the United States, with Nick Johnson (2017) providing an environmental history which argues that federal marijuana prohibition has had impacts on the practices of those growing cannabis crops that have resulted in ecological degradation.²⁴ Emily Dufton (2017) has reached beyond formal policy circles to trace the activists on both sides of the debate about cannabis controls in the United States and to uncover their attitudes and agendas since the 1960s.²⁵

All of this activity has stimulated research in other parts of the world. Chris Duvall's *The African Roots of Marijuana* (2019) argues that the Bantu word *marimba* is the source of the term "marijuana." This word, together with the sub-Saharan habit of smoking plants and herbs through the use of water pipes, has prompted Duvall to assert that, "African knowledge underlies practices of psychoactive cannabis use around the Atlantic."²⁶ While this effort at decentering the West, or the Americas, in histories of the plant is provocative, the book has been criticized for its reliance on Western archives

and materials and lack of research in Africa itself.²⁷ This is not a weakness of other recent work about sub-Saharan Africa. A brief but useful section on cannabis in an article by Emmanuel Akyeampong (2005) devoted to the wider topic of drug trafficking in the West African diaspora showed that Sierra Leone became an important hub for cannabis production by the 1920s. Initially it was cultivated there and consumed locally, but by the 1930s cannabis was being exported to markets along the West African coast. The return of ex-servicemen from the Second World War who had picked up the habit of consuming cannabis in Asia established a market for it in Ghana, which ultimately stimulated local production there too. By the 1980s, Ghana and Nigeria, together with Mozambique and South Africa, were illicitly producing cannabis for export.²⁸ In considering Nigeria, Klantschnig (2014) emphasizes the interaction of the local and the international too, arguing that:

The story of cannabis in Nigeria shows how cannabis became an important part of Nigerian public discourse long before foreign agencies lamented the continent's role in the global drug trade and how public concerns about drugs and their control were never completely imposed from abroad, although foreign influences played an important part in the forming of hybrid ideas about drugs, addiction, and drug control in Nigeria.²⁹

Utathya Chattopadhyaya (2019) similarly examines international networks through the politics of dagga, or cannabis, in South Africa in the 1920s. These were imperial scientific circles, and he traces how experiments conducted in the Union of South Africa and by the British administration in India were evidence of the efforts of colonial states to reframe cannabis as a legitimate commercial crop.³⁰

This connection with India also points to histories of the plant and substances made from it in South Asia. *Cannabis Britannica* and *Cannabis Nation* both explored various aspects of experiences in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, from the pioneering experiments of William O'Shaughnessy in Calcutta to the efforts of the government of India to resist an international prohibition regime after independence in the 1950s. Peter Hynd's doctoral work at McGill University promises fresh perspectives on cannabis in colonial India.

The South Asian diaspora has been an important element in studies of the West Indies, such as Peter Hanoomansingh's "Crown Colony and the Problem of Ganja in Nineteenth-Century Trinidad" (2011) and "'Up in Smoke': Opium and Indentured Labour in Mauritius, British Guiana, and Trinidad, 1834–1912," by Jamie Banks (2020).³¹ James Bradford's recent

(2019) book, *Poppies, Politics, and Power: Afghanistan and the Global History of Drugs and Diplomacy*, includes important material on cannabis, emphasizing the interconnectedness of trade in the substance there with South Asia and Iran, and its emergence as a major source of cannabis for Western markets in the 1960s and 1970s.³² References to these recent and forthcoming studies suggests that the new wave of academic cannabis histories shows no sign of abating. Other important work in the current generation of such histories includes David Guba's *Taming Cannabis: Drugs and Empire in Nineteenth-Century France* (2020) and Haggai Ram's *Intoxicating Zion: A Social History of Hashish in Mandatory Palestine and Israel* (2020).³³ In part, this volume of essays is designed as an exercise in taking stock of a field that has rapidly developed over the past two decades and which looks set to remain a vibrant area of activity for some time to come.

Cannabis: Global Histories?

This volume, *Cannabis: Global Histories*, has ambitions that go beyond simply taking stock however. The 2018 conference from which this book takes its name, and from which most of the essays are drawn, was designed to gather together many of those working in the new wave of academic cannabis histories to explore what would happen when they were invited to think beyond nation states and national borders. In part, the event was inspired by the influential collection of papers on cocaine edited by Paul Gootenberg in 1999 which used "major national stories" to seek "covert social, cultural, and political transformations" more broadly.³⁴ What is striking in relating that project to this is the relationship between histories and politics. Two decades ago, the Gootenberg volume was possible because there was a community of historians working on cocaine research in the 1990s, which was linked to the importance of that commodity in the domestic and diplomatic politics of the United States in the 1980s. This cannabis volume, by contrast, would not have been possible back then, because there was no such comparable community working on cannabis histories. As the above survey of the literature has demonstrated that community of scholars working on cannabis has only emerged since 1999. It can be directly related to the wider changes of the period. In that time, scientific and medical perceptions of cannabis have become more complex, government and regulatory frameworks for dealing with the plant and its products have diversified, consumers have

become better organized and more vociferous, and the emergence of the idea of Big Marijuana draws the eye to the array of commercial interests that are seeking to reframe preparations of cannabis as commodities for potential investors (and as sources of revenue for the authorities). With these cannabis-related activities intensifying, it is little wonder that historians have headed for the archives in order to explain them.

Mazyar Ghiabi recently wrote that "few commodities are as global as drugs,"³⁵ and it is argued here that few drugs are as global as cannabis. While this volume is certainly not comprehensive in examining every nation or even every continent, it ranges widely enough to establish that cannabis products now have histories around the world. The same might be said for opium, opiates, and opioids, for example. What makes cannabis particularly notable for historians is that unlike those substances, its histories have for large periods been entirely illicit and illegitimate according to those with political, scientific, medical, and social power. Derivatives of opium have always had legitimate and legal applications as medicines and as painkillers, even when their use for other purposes has been prohibited. This means that across the course of modern history doctors have continued to trust in them, scientists to research them, corporations to develop and market them, and governments to tolerate them.

The year 1952 looms large in histories of cannabis. That year, the WHO declared that cannabis substances no longer had any legitimate medical or scientific uses. This meant that most doctors and scientists completely ignored them, pharmaceutical companies looked elsewhere for research and development projects likely to prove profitable, and by 1961 governments had eventually agreed to subject them to the strictest controls under the Single Convention. Many of the usual suspects in the history of globalization—modern medical science, capitalist entrepreneurs, and Western states—combined against cannabis. Yet, in 2020, the UNODC observed that:

The most widely used drug worldwide continues to be cannabis, with an estimated 188 million people having used the drug in the previous year. The prevalence of cannabis use has remained broadly stable at the global level for a decade, even with the rising trends in the Americas and Asia.³⁶

In other words, it appears that the globalization of the plant and its products took place without, indeed despite, many of the agents and agencies usually thought to be central to globalizing processes. Explaining this should be of interest not only to historians of drugs, intoxicants, and medicines

but also to scholars engaged with globalization, and to those concerned with maintaining and revising control regimes around the world.

The obvious place to start in explaining this “globalization without globalizers” is at the beginning of the paper trail. In this volume, that can be found in the archives of nineteenth-century Western empires, and Guba, Hynd, and Banks all explore the ways in which European colonizers engaged with the cannabis-consuming societies that they encountered. As becomes clear, though, these sources reveal a lot about the concerns, interests, and ignorance of the agents of those building these empires, but they unfortunately tell very little about the societies around them. Guba, for example, examines the ways in which myths about cannabis and its consumers were formed from within Orientalist intellectual currents in France at the same time as the plant was claimed by the nation’s medical circles as a source of therapeutics to be honed by French expertise. Crucially, he also explains how ideas about cannabis formed in colonial contexts were “globalized,” as the international networks of modern medicine used their journals to transmit news of the plant’s potential around the world. In Jamie Banks’s chapter, situated in British Guiana and Trinidad, he traces a related tale about the creation of a notion of “ganja madness” in medical circles—in addition to showing how the concept was deployed and received. For comparative purposes, he builds Jamaica and Mauritius into his narrative and argues that the development and utility of medical knowledge regarding cannabis in this time and space offers lessons about the fractured and often contradictory nature of British colonialism.

Hynd’s chapter, which also explores the British Empire, suggests that certain colonial era documents can be useful for more than simply exploring the ways in which myths and misunderstandings were created as colonizers encountered cannabis. His account is of the tangled policies of colonial officials toward taxing cannabis commerce in nineteenth-century India. It reveals how specialist producers adapted environments to create crops that were prized for their psychoactive content, that various mechanisms were used by wholesalers to secure those crops at advantageous prices, and shows that most retailers were small-scale operators set up to supply consumers in market-towns across the country. In short, the network established to get the products to market, and to ensure that an income was generated by those involved at each stage of production and distribution, looked very similar to that for other agricultural commodities in colonial India. Government

policies were mainly aimed at taking a slice of those incomes, although Hynd adds that this was not the only consideration. Many officials had arrived at the conclusion that consumption of cannabis products ought to be limited, partly because of the misunderstandings of the colonial encounter, partly because of a Protestant mistrust of intoxication, and partly because they listened to local voices that disapproved of its consumption. They saw tax as a means of inflating the price of cannabis products to levels where they hoped excessive consumption would be discouraged. This created a new anxiety, one that historians should be careful to note. The anxiety was that cannabis customers would simply look to other sources of intoxication if the price was inflated too far, and the evidence in the colonial archives holds that this often proved to be the case. Opium, toddy, and other substances found themselves in favor when cannabis became an expensive indulgence. Vera Rubin named the "ganja-complex" after what she thought was a timeless and unchanging taste for cannabis in south Asia.³⁷ Hynd's study suggests that there was no such thing, and it reminds historians that often there is no such type as a cannabis-consumer. In its place seems to be something more complex: a seeker of intoxication, or pain-relief, or a few laughs in company, and so on, who sometimes happened upon cannabis at the moment of seeking.

When taken together, the three essays are valuable reminders that the nineteenth century was fundamentally important for global histories of cannabis in the modern period. Colonialism moved cannabis consumers around the world, establishing new markets for the plant outside of spaces and places where it was being consumed prior to European arrival. Colonialism also generated and circulated ideas about the plant and its products, which were often flights of Orientalist fancy of course, but which would linger in Western societies, and go on to shape cannabis ideas elsewhere. Colonial tax regimes, however, revealed that those who consumed cannabis were often anything but devotees of the drug; instead, these individuals were simply seeking intoxication and would happily abandon cannabis preparations for other drinks or drugs according to availability and price. For all the Orientalist fantasies about the figure of the cannabis-consumer, excise receipts demonstrated that these individuals could be difficult to find when the price was not right or if there was a range of substances to choose from.

In the early decades of the twentieth century, other forces around the world also shaped ideas about, and approaches to, cannabis products. The

chapters by Thembisa Waetjen, Haggai Ram, José Domingo Schievenini, and Isaac Campos focus on South Africa, North Africa, and Mexico respectively, and draw out the ways in which the processes of nation-building and internationalization affected cannabis. Schievenini argues that the changing nature of the state in Mexico drove changing attitudes toward marijuana and its consumers. The Spanish colonial state viewed those that it encountered there as an Other, and habits associated with them were dismissed as dark, mysterious, and dangerous. The newly independent state reframed cannabis as a symbol of the potential of an environment and a people liberated from the oppressive regime that went before it. By the twentieth century groups familiar from nation-building around the modern world began to take control of the state: political elites intent upon shaping the local population into an efficient workforce, aided by a well-organized medical profession keen to secure a monopoly over healthcare. Increasingly viewed as a marker of indolence, cannabis was also regarded as a threat by medical professionals who resented cheap and useful substances that rivalled their products in the therapeutic marketplace. With a grip on political power and the mechanisms for deciding what was modern and scientific, Mexican elites imposed controls on cannabis, which were in fact controls on the population and the ways it could behave. In looking at the story of Dr. Salazar Viniegra, Campos shows how these elites rigorously upheld their orthodoxies in the 1930s in the face of efforts to change perceptions of the plant and its preparations.

Waetjen traces a related story in the Union of South Africa. Set against the backdrop of political change, in which a fractured set of colonies became a British dominion in 1910 and a nation state in 1931, dagga policy became a means of intervening in sections of the local population. The forces of nation-building, political elites and an emerging medical profession, combined to claim a monopoly over healthcare provision. They were instrumental in reframing and asserting control over dagga consumption there, which had been an acceptable practice for over six hundred years. Waetjen's chapter also illustrates that local consumption was not somehow timeless and immutable but was, in fact, expanding as mine workers familiar with the plant and its properties introduced it to colleagues from communities that were not. She argues that there was plenty of opposition to the emergence of controls on dagga—from those who produced it to those who managed the mines and could state from experience that the figure of the dangerous or demotivated dagga smoker was an entirely imagined one. Despite this,

cannabis consumption suffered the familiar fate of prohibition for all but medical and scientific purposes.

Ram takes up another of the observations made in Waetjen's article about the interrelationship between cannabis knowledge generated in particular states and the global circulation of these ideas through the emerging network of international organizations. His article focuses on the League of Nations Opium Advisory Committee (OAC), established as a permanent body in 1920, which survives today as the UN Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC). It is such a central part of the story of the global histories of cannabis precisely because it was created to globalize policy on psychoactive substances. Ram unpicks how experts, gathered from across member states, engineered a consensus on the properties of cannabis by layering evidence from around the world. Particularly prominent among these experts were representatives of European empires or of former colonial states eager to present themselves as members of the modern, international, and scientific community. Unsurprisingly, then, the Orientalist and racist generalizations that developed in the colonial encounters of the 1800s found themselves dressed in the new language of scientifically established truth. Even when participants spoke out against the recycled myths of the nineteenth century, they were ignored. Dismissed were the glimpses that some of the evidence gave of complex and changing markets for cannabis, and of the cultural intricacies of the many societies and cultures across North Africa. In their place, Ram demonstrates that familiar generalizations about the childish nature of the Muslim and his (the imagined figure was always male) inability to control himself in the face of pleasure became the dominant discourse on cannabis within expert circles at the League of Nations. The OAC was very successful at globalizing ideas about cannabis in the 1920s and 1930s. Regrettably, those ideas were racist and Orientalist in origin.

This central idea, of the cannabis consumer as Other, took on new levels of meaning as it traveled. Klantschnig shows that in West Africa it traveled as doctors did. One of his main protagonists, Thomas Adeoye Lambo, left Nigeria in 1952 for the colonial heartland to study medicine at the University of Birmingham, followed by further training at the Institute of Psychiatry, King's College London. He became interested in both social science and the studies of addiction of the period, and when back in Nigeria Lambo observed the growing taste for cannabis. He called preparations of the plant the comfort of "marginal Africans," people he described as those uprooted

from the structured societies of rural villages who endured a life of migration in their search for work and wages. The idea took root and was militarized when army officers seized power in the independent Nigeria of the 1960s. With the country in chaos, the coup's leaders intended to impose order, and the 1966 Indian Hemp Decree was one element of their efforts; it included tough penalties, such as a death sentence for cultivators and long prison sentences for smugglers. The cannabis consumer had become the enemy of nation-builders in postcolonial Nigeria, and the medical elite had once again provided the evidence.

Klantschnig shows that the story was more complex still, and that markets in Nigeria for substances made from the plant were part of a cultural phenomenon that was spreading globally. Cannabis consumption was becoming cool. Precisely because the notion was well-established in so many places that it was the drug of the Other, those that rejected the orthodoxies of the period saw in it a powerful symbol for challenging the authorities. In Nigeria, popular musicians like Fela Kuti and their acolytes took to cannabis because of its association with youth movements elsewhere. Kuti associated it with the jazz clubs of London, where he had played while studying music between 1958 and 1963, a period when cannabis was adopted by the white middle-class youth of the city as the substance used by the African and West Indian migrants there. The drug of the colonial Other was taken to the metropole by workers who had answered the mother-country's call for labor in the wake of the Second World War. It was then self-consciously smoked as part of the cultural politics of the period, as a section of Britain's youth rejected the nation's history of imperialism, conflict, and racism by embracing what they interpreted as the ways of Africa and Asia.³⁸

The chapters by Snelders, Bradford, and Richardson-Little trace the circulation of the "cannabis-as-cool" idea in Europe and Asia in that period and some of the impacts of this. In West Germany, "collectively smoking cannabis symbolized the creation of new forms of noncapitalist communities,"³⁹ while in the Netherlands the "counterculture of the 1960s produced smugglers who perceived cannabis use and trade in the context of a rebellion against 'straight society.'"⁴⁰ In East Germany, the government presented cannabis as the comfort of the disillusioned victims of capitalism, which meant that local youth viewed it as glamorous and subversive, even if they rarely got their hands on any because there was little product to trade and their currency could not be easily exchanged anyway. The establishment of

these new markets for cannabis in Europe (and elsewhere in the Western world) included a curious geographical twist, as suddenly there were consumers where psychoactive products of cannabis could not be produced. The plant is environmentally sensitive, so while hemp had a long history in Northern Europe as a source of fibers for rope and cordage, the dark and the wet meant that it was difficult to grow for intoxicating purposes.

Snelders and Bradford explore this twist, and they trace the ways in which new markets were connected to regions that were sources of psychoactive cannabis. Bradford explains how the Afghan economy found itself suddenly growing new connections across the Middle East and as far as Europe and North America when Western travelers arrived in search of cannabis for their own consumption and for export back home. At first they were small-scale smugglers, but over time the commerce boomed and more coherent organizations evolved or got involved. While cannabis may have been the commodity that drove the greater integration of Afghanistan's economy into the wider global one, it was the nation's opium poppies and the heroin produced from them that would come to dominate.⁴¹ Snelders studies this process from the Dutch end. In the 1960s, securing cannabis was seen by many members of the counterculture in the Netherlands as an act of political resistance, so smuggling was done less for financial gain and more for political and social kudos. However, as the market grew, the maritime history of the Netherlands gave it an advantage. Experienced seamen were certainly used to trading in Africa and Asia, and fishermen were experienced in carrying more than fish on their boats—thus, cannabis became just another clandestine commodity carried alongside legitimate cargo.

The final section of this collection brings together four chapters that consider the fate of the cannabis consensus that dominated government and medical circles for most of the twentieth century. After the 1925 Geneva Convention on Opium and Other Drugs, cannabis was included in the international drugs regulatory system; from then onward, states around the world were expected to prevent its consumption for anything but medical and scientific purposes. As mentioned earlier, the 1952 World Health Organization (WHO) declaration on cannabis stated that it was now obsolete as a source for medicines. After that, there seemed to be no legitimate purposes at all for the plant and its preparations. Over the last two decades, this status quo has been repeatedly challenged and has started to fracture. Several governments around the world have decriminalized, or even legalized, various

forms of cannabis consumption. Significantly, in 2019 the director general of the WHO reversed the position established in 1952. He recommended that cannabis and associated substances be rescheduled in the international drug control framework to pave the way for a legal trade in them for medicinal and scientific purposes.

Ghiabi, Dufton, Carrier, and Taylor explore this period of cannabis consensus and some of the forces that have challenged it. All make the point that the consensus was never fully stable. Both Ghiabi and Carrier explain that there were often significant gaps between policy and practice. Ghiabi argues that in Iran a long history of cannabis consumption ensured that it was widely accepted across society and culture. Multiple preparations of the plant, which could be taken alone or in combination with other substances, continued to be widely available there throughout the twentieth century. The complex meanings of cannabis consumption in Iran, and the long traditions associated with it, meant that while various Iranian regimes often clamped down on alcohol and opiates, the authorities have tended to turn a blind eye to violations of the controls imposed on cannabis by the international consensus. Carrier, for his part, draws attention to similar stories from across sub-Saharan Africa. He shows that the authorities in most countries there tended to ignore cannabis consumption. In many parts of East Africa it has a history stretching back hundreds of years, in states as far apart as Kenya and Lesotho, where many regard cannabis as a traditional item as well as a source of useful medicine. Not that its place in local cultures is fixed or static, as reggae music has legitimized its consumption for some, and its potential as an export crop for emerging markets in the West has encouraged others to see it in a new light. Enforcement only takes place when the local police or government drugs agency needs to prove its worth, as arresting those selling or consuming cannabis is easier than chasing heroin gangs. The cannabis trade may be illegal in sub-Saharan Africa, but according to Carrier, the multiple histories and meanings of the plant and its preparations mean that officials, enforcers, suppliers, and consumers often agree that it is not illicit. It seems that the local has often proven to be an effective barrier to the global in the enforcement of cannabis control regimes.

While Ghiabi and Carrier explore the reasons that cannabis has become illegal but not illicit in many places around the world, Dufton and Taylor provide reminders that cannabis laws and policies have never been entirely

in the hands of the policymakers, scientific experts, or state enforcers. Both chapters scrutinize how special interest groups have managed to insert themselves into the policy process to successfully lobby for new directions in cannabis control. Dufton argues that under the Carter administration of the 1970s in the United States, the decriminalization of cannabis possession and consumption enabled ready access to the plant and its products in many states across the country. Alongside this, a profitable industry developed to produce and sell “stoner” culture paraphernalia, which ranged from magazines such as *High Times* and *Stone Age* to a baby-bottle fitted with a hashish pipe. Much of this was targeted at teenagers; by 1976 growing alarm among parents resulted in the foundation in the state of Georgia of the Parents’ Resource Institute on Drug Education (PRIDE). Over the subsequent decade, PRIDE was highly effective in connecting with government agencies and important political actors, Nancy Reagan being chief among them. The aim—the recriminalization of activities in the cannabis marketplace—aligned with the government’s conservative agenda and Nancy Reagan’s personal ambitions. It was only once she had achieved a change of public image, and it became clear that the United States was faced with the more complex issues of heroin and cocaine consumption, that PRIDE began to falter.

Taylor identifies a similar phenomenon but from the other side of the cannabis debate. She examines the role of patient groups in lobbying for access to, and research into, cannabis-based medicines in the UK and the United States since the 1970s. In the latter, Robert Randall found that cannabis alone relieved the symptoms of his glaucoma, and he successfully took the authorities to court when they raided his house to seize home-grown supplies. This led to the foundation in 1981 of the Alliance for Cannabis Therapeutics (ACT), which proved an inspiration for the UK version, founded in 1992. Alongside the Multiple Sclerosis Society (MS) and the Multiple Sclerosis Trust (MT), the UK’s ACT campaigned successfully for the remedicalization of cannabis. It raised funding for scientific research into the plant and its properties, encouraged those across the UK’s medical community to reengage with its therapeutic potential, and eventually persuaded the Home Office to license trials; these allowed access to a new pharmaceutical cannabis product, albeit on a named-patient basis. In Taylor’s view, central to this process was the concept of respectability, as these patient groups presented a reassuringly middle-class face to scientific and state agencies.

Globalization: Cannabis Histories?

While the summary above demonstrates that cannabis products now have histories around the world, that does not necessarily answer the question implicit in this volume's title. Namely, does cannabis have a global history, or global histories? While the idea of "global history" remains a fluid and contested notion, this introduction takes it in the simplest form: as the study of what Lynn Hunt has called a "series of transnational processes in which the histories of diverse places become connected and interdependent," perhaps to that point "when the entire world seem[s] to have become interdependent for the first time."⁴² The editors of this volume conclude that the evidence in the chapters gathered here, as well as the studies mentioned above in the new wave of cannabis histories, illustrate how the plant and its preparations do indeed have a history operating within that set of transnational processes. Nonetheless, cannabis' many trajectories around the world are a reminder of just how fraught globalization has been with tensions, contradictions, and adaptations in numerous local contexts. Tracing these trajectories more deeply seems important, then, for addressing the knowledge gaps in the global histories of cannabis that remain for future researchers.

A straightforward sketch of the global history of cannabis in the modern world looks something like this. Cannabis consumption was common in many different places five hundred or so years ago.⁴³ This consumption took place in environments where the plant produced the chemicals necessary for therapeutic and psychoactive substances. Since then, the processes that have driven increasing global interconnectedness over the early modern and modern periods—from the spice trade to the development of pharmacopeias—have served to create new markets to suit the purposes of medication or intoxication.⁴⁴ These processes have also created and disseminated new ideas about the consumers that constitute those markets, and about the plant itself.

In the nineteenth century, the Western empires forced their way into regions where there were long-established cannabis-consuming societies, and then intruded into local commerce and culture. Their primary objectives were economic, so various empires set about establishing what could be bought, sold, and taxed, while also worrying about how best to coerce the people they encountered into serving as laborers fit for the purposes of their production systems. In the colonies themselves no fixed pattern

developed regarding intervention, and within any given nation's empire there could be wide variation in efforts to control cannabis markets, from loose licensing systems to outright prohibition for anything but medical and scientific purposes. Enforcement efforts, or lack of them, complicated the picture further, as did acts of resistance. Nevertheless, what most of these colonies had in common was state intervention itself: meaning, in many colonized jurisdictions cannabis consumption suddenly became a government matter for the first time. The Orientalist assumptions of empire-builders, the bewilderment of Europeans confronted by societies and cultures beyond their own borders, and anxieties that unfamiliar intoxicants were behind the reluctance of locals to be exploited as laborers, or might inspire them to resist more vigorously, all served to label cannabis substances as unpredictable or dangerous. Imperial networks, particularly those established by doctors, botanists, and those in allied sciences, circulated and amplified these anxieties around the world.

More than just ideas were circulating, however, as cannabis-consumers were shipped between colonies to meet labor shortages or made the decision for themselves to migrate within empires in search of opportunities. It seems that these consumers took with them their habits, and once settled—sometimes far from home—they formed markets for their customary comforts and shared them with new neighbors. The inter-connections formed in these social contexts, in which cannabis crossed borders and instigated new contacts despite the colonial authorities, rather than because of them, are ripe for future research, particularly by those with expertise in fields like Indian and Atlantic Ocean Studies. Similarly, other migrations of the nineteenth century seem full of potential for historians seeking to trace movements of cannabis. The migrations within the Ottoman Empire, as it endured a slow collapse before 1914,⁴⁵ or the flows of workers between and across the states of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay in the late 1800s,⁴⁶ seem particularly promising in this regard.

Cannabis became caught up in the projects of nation and state building in the modern period too. Chapters in this volume have illustrated that regulation and control could be driven by the domestic agendas of modernizing governments rather than by international organizations or imperial intruders. There are intriguing parallels between nation-builders and empire-builders in the stories of cannabis however. With both, an alliance between officials and the medical authorities, and a sense that consumers

of the plant and its preparations were threats to the economic and civilizing missions of these elites, figure prominently. But chapters also demonstrated that enforcement of laws and regulations in many states depends on local politics and agencies, particularly in societies where “illegal” and “illicit” are often understood to be very different terms. This shows that approaches to the control of cannabis may often have been framed within a global discourse pushed by international agencies—but what this has meant in practice seems often to have been shaped by local ideas, politics, and contingencies. There is more research to be done into the constraints on, and local configurations of, cannabis controls from 1925 onwards as it has often been assumed that a global consensus characterized this period.

Efforts to establish and maintain that global consensus were the work of the international organizations that emerged in the inter-war decades. Some historians have been rightly keen to point out that Western empires should not loom too large in the story of Global History, since this risks Eurocentrism.⁴⁷ But it is certainly the case that with cannabis such influence lingers on until today—mainly because it was two countries which had been under the control of the British, South Africa and Egypt, that forced cannabis into the League of Nations opium debates of the 1920s. Further imperial tensions between British, Chinese, and American diplomats over opium issues in Asia underpinned the inclusion of cannabis in the international drugs regulatory system in 1925, where it has remained ever since.

But while the representatives of various nations have at one time or another sought to dominate dialogue about cannabis, their actions have been within an international framework set over the last hundred years by what is now the United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC), and at crucial moments by the World Health Organization too. Committees at these international bodies have actively intervened to privilege certain kinds of data and conclusion over others and to prescribe research agendas that suited narrow purposes. The role of the secretariats at these international institutions, which stand accused of carefully selecting evidence at key moments in cannabis policymaking in order to broaden the remit of the international drugs regulatory system, merits closer attention by researchers. These organizations have remained key agents in the globalization of scientific, legal, and policy approaches to the plant and its preparations throughout the last century or so; historians face the challenge of delving deeper into their archives to establish just what agendas lay behind

the conclusions on cannabis that they have been so keen to encourage. This task is made more timely when considering the United Nations' decision at the end of 2020 "to remove cannabis and cannabis resin from a category of the world's most dangerous drugs," which followed a 2019 "recommendation by the World Health Organization (WHO) that research into its medical use is made easier."⁴⁸ Striking cannabis from Schedule IV of the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs was called "historic" and a "win" in many circles, yet not all countries were happy—and it will be the historian's job to properly contextualize the UN decision in years to come.⁴⁹

Regarding consumption in the twentieth century, the question remains of what has driven the establishment of new markets around the world. The simple answer is consumers. With the absence in the story of the large "globalizers," such as corporations pushing their products, or colonial governments driving empires with drugs money, cannabis as a commodity offers a fascinating study in the power of consumers to build markets. Migration remains an important element of the consumption story across the twentieth century. Soldiers returning to Africa, the Americas and Europe from Asian wars, or workers moving to metropolises from across failing empires, carried cannabis consumption with them. A new factor complicated this story in the second half of the century. The so-called countercultures of Western societies from the 1960s onward reworked the association between cannabis use and the colonized Other of the imperial period. That Asians, Africans, and South Americans consumed the plant in various ways loaded it with potent symbolism for those individuals in Western societies seeking to reject the traditional values and ways of life related to home, church, companies, and government. Conspicuously consuming cannabis enabled them to reject the alcohol and tobacco used by an older generation, to defy the establishment, and to ignore the normalized products and lifestyles promoted by those corporations. Magazines, records, the spread of radio and television, and the emergence of cannabis-celebrities like Bob Marley, Allen Ginsberg, and Timothy Leary all served to communicate globally this anti-authoritarian version of cannabis. The plant and its preparations were politicized, and consuming it became "cool" around the world, a gesture of defiance or rebellion in the face of whoever the local authorities might be.

An outcome of this perceptual change was transnational drugs tourism, and a steady flow of those "dropping out" of Western societies went in search of cultures where cannabis had long been cultivated and consumed.⁵⁰

Counter-culture pilgrims to South Asia travelled along routes which quickly became conduits for the trade in cannabis, and later heroin, for markets back in Europe. Elsewhere, high-quality cannabis seeds from the United States were carried by members of the Peace Corps to Colombia to replace local strains. The better-quality crop was subsequently smuggled north to meet demand among American counter-culture devotees.⁵¹ Drugs tourism remains an under-researched issue by historians, and drugs tourism within nations, rather than across them, is particularly neglected. The topic, which has its links to issues of “medical tourism” too, promises rich pickings for future historical work.⁵²

Exploring these market developments draws the eye to the changing economics of cannabis over the last fifty years or so. Since the 1960s, supply across borders and continents has become increasingly well-organized and complex, and the transportation of cannabis was often undertaken alongside that of other commodities—legal and illegal—by groups used to speculation on smuggling. While the influence of the counterculture in driving new markets is obvious, more archival research and fieldwork is necessary to trace the relationship between demand and supply in their emergence in the last decades of the twentieth century. As this volume has illustrated, suppliers of cannabis preparations, and the paraphernalia that boosted their profits, were blurring the line between licit and illicit commerce in the 1970s. Most notably, this occurred in the United States, a nation more readily associated with “war on drugs” style enforcement of controls since the late 1960s. While cannabis commerce subsequently found itself squarely put back in the illicit-business box there in the 1980s, it suggests that the rise of Big Marijuana in the United States since 2010 may have deeper roots which require closer historical investigation.⁵³

With investors now keen to make money from cannabis, the implications are already being felt around the world. African states such as Lesotho are responding to increasing global demand for cannabis products by expanding production and establishing partnerships with investment groups. There, a British-owned phyto-extractions company, Verve Dynamic Ltd, joined up with Lesotho businessman, Sam Matekane, to open a medical CBD processing facility in the southern African country.⁵⁴ The British company already has a customer for the products, the Canadian corporation Aphria, which describes itself as “a global leader in the cannabis industry” and boasts that “we are bringing Aphria’s expertise, experience

and know-how to the most strategic opportunities in international markets today."⁵⁵ For the first time in its history, billions of licit dollars are being ploughed into developing the cannabis industry, and historians will be kept busy exploring the drivers behind this for some time to come. However, it remains to be seen if this brush with globalization brings lasting economic benefits to those producing the cannabis itself in countries like Lesotho.

Another vital element in the recent global history of cannabis, and one clearly related to international governance, consumption, and the creation of markets, is the plant's "remedicalization" through biomedicine. Aphria, as discussed above, is buying Lesotho's CBD extract for products it will sell as therapeutic agents—and there are other similar examples across the planet. Importantly, the return of medical cannabis—emerging in the 1970s, but only becoming a force since the 1990s—was influenced by consumers, rather than scientists or suppliers. Both followed the lead of various patient-groups seeking less harmful, and more effective, painkillers. Biomedicine is a scientific instrument in globalization, and shifting attitudes over the last quarter of a century or so, among allopathic doctors, pharmacologists, and in related scientific circles, have been central to reconsiderations of cannabis around the world. These reconsiderations have addressed not just its potential as a source of therapeutics, but its likely harms too. Yet, this "remedicalization" has been a diverse phenomenon, and work in this volume has suggested that the intersections of biomedical discourses and local healing systems need more study. The subject of medical cannabis has not been ignored in the social sciences, but improved historical work is needed, and this promises to be a fascinating field for further research.⁵⁶

Breaking news: Cannabis has global histories. That is clear. Elements of globalization such as western imperialism, the processes of nation-building, long-distance labor migrations, the emergence of international agencies in world governance, tourism, commercial interests, and latterly capitalist corporations, have all impacted on the history of cannabis and its place in so many different parts of the world. This comes with the caveat that local forces have also been significant in shaping the ways in which this globalization of cannabis has played out in individual contexts. If examples from the past and present offered in this volume help us draw a firm conclusion about the future, it is this: the years ahead will witness further contests over cannabis, and these will extend far beyond its use or misuse in treating COVID-19. The Agnihotri episode at the start of this introduction saw a

tangle of culture, economics, and biomedicine created through a variety of media outlets and platforms, across multiple nation-states—and historians will need to be prepared to unpick many similarly complex global stories.

The future might also include answers to one final question which dawned on the editors of this volume as the project came to an end. Does globalization have cannabis histories? In other words, how often have the histories of diverse places become connected and interdependent because of cannabis consumers, eager to share their habit with others, or to source substances when far from home? Or because government officials and law-enforcers have forged new links across nations to seek intelligence on movements of cannabis or to interdict flows through borders? Or because doctors, medical scientists, or pharmaceutical companies have sought out others around the world that shared their interest in such a complex plant?

At this point in time, all we can safely say is that “Globalization: Cannabis Histories” is a project best left to the next generation of historians of the plant and its preparations.

Notes

1. Vivek Ranjan Agnihotri, “Solution to a lot of the world’s problems lie in India. But you can’t find them as long as you ridicule our ancient wisdom. Cannabis is a magic plant. Till mid 80s it was sold by Govt. Because of Rajiv Gandhi and western Pharma companies it got bad name. Make cannabis legal,” Twitter, February 8, 2020. The tweet has since been deleted from Agnihotri’s account.
2. See “Live Breaking News Weed Kills Corona Virus 739 Scientists Are Shocked to Discover that Weed Kills Corona Virus,” Dopl3r (website), accessed October 14, 2020, <https://en.dopl3r.com/memes/dank/live-breaking-news-weed-kills-corona-virus-739-scientist-are-shocked-to-discover-that-weed-kills-corona-virus/917661>.
3. “About Us,” Dopl3r (website), accessed May 27, 2020, <https://en.dopl3r.com/about-us>.
4. The image was still available there at time of writing (January 28, 2021). See “Live Breaking News.”
5. Peter Jonathan Hanna (@peterjonathanna), “The coronavirus is probably going to be the worst deadly virus in modern history. Cannabis has several dozen antivirals medicines in it and all the other hundreds of medicines in cannabis will greatly improve your immune system and protect you from this virus. Prepare!” Twitter, January 28, 2020, 8:43 a.m., <https://twitter.com/peterjonathanna/status/1222153159851888645>.

6. Peter Jonathan Hanna (@peterjonathanna), "Orally consuming cannabis can give you immunity from Coronavirus AND cannabis can cure your Coronavirus. Don't believe me? Cannabis is the most powerful medicine in the world, the most powerful antiviral in the world and the medicine with the most medicines in the world. FACTS!" Twitter, January 27, 2020, 7:38 p.m., <https://twitter.com/peterjonathanna/status/1221955711393026048>.

7. Editorial Board, "Facebook Is Taking Aim at Coronavirus Misinformation. Others Should Follow Suit," *Washington Post*, January 31, 2020, https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/facebook-is-taking-aim-at-coronavirus-misinformation-others-should-follow-suit/2020/01/31/d97f758a-445d-11ea-b503-2b077c436617_story.html.

8. Alt News, "Fact Check: Weed Kills Coronavirus?" *Decan Herald*, February 10, 2020, <https://www.deccanherald.com/national/fact-check-weed-kills-coronavirus-vivek-agnihotri-shares-scientific-misinformation-via-meme-803236.html>.

9. "Weed Cures Coronavirus? Filmmaker's Tweet on Cannabis Being a Medicine to Deadly Disease is a Meme," *Latestly*, February 8, 2020, <https://www.latestly.com/social-viral/fact-check/weed-cures-coronavirus-filmmakers-tweet-on-cannabis-being-a-medicine-to-deadly-disease-is-a-meme-check-whos-list-of-fact-checks-on-cure-and-treatment-1525223.html>; "About Us," *Latestly*, accessed October 15, 2020, <https://www.latestly.com/about-us/>.

10. Charles-Nicolas-Sigisbert Sonnini de Manoncourt, *Voyage dans la haute et basse Égypte*, vol. 3 (Paris: F. Buisson, 1798), 103. W. B. O'Shaughnessy, "Extract from a Memoir on the Preparations of the Indian Hemp, or Gunjah (Cannabis Indica) their Effects on the Animal System in Health, and Their Utility in the Treatment of Tetanus and Other Convulsive Diseases," *Journal of the Asiatic Society* (1839): 739.

11. Cannabis publishing is presently in a growth phase, although much of the work, as in yesteryears, might be characterized as popular. Many of these kinds of books employ well-meaning alternative health and religion philosophies. Others are intended as amusing, general information manuals. Readers are certainly being exposed to cannabis customs and terminology in addition to detailed how-to books regarding dinner parties; many of these are straightforwardly journalistic. A third and final category adopts a darker edge and presents the various dangers that cannabis poses to the planet. For a cross-section of the above, see, for instance, Stephen Gray, *Cannabis and Spirituality: An Explorer's Guide to an Ancient Plant Spirit Ally* (Toronto: Park Street Press, 2016); John Charles Chasteen, *Getting High: Marijuana Through the Ages* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016); and Mark S. Ferrara, *Sacred Bliss: A Spiritual History of Cannabis* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016). Other examples include: Joe Dolce, *Brave New Weed: Adventures into the Uncharted World of Cannabis* (New York: HarperCollins, 2016); Alex Halperin, *The Cannabis Dictionary* (New York: Mitchell Beazley, 2020); Lizzie Post, *Higher Etiquette: A Guide to the World of Cannabis, from Dispensaries to Dinner Parties* (Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed Press, 2019);

and David Bienenstock, *How to Smoke Pot (Properly): A Highbrow Guide to Getting High* (New York: Plume, 2016).

12. Vera Rubin, ed., *Cannabis and Culture* (Berlin: De Gruyter: Mouton, 1975), 1–4. For another glimpse of academic historical writing on cannabis in this period see William D. Armstrong and John Parascandola, “American Concern over Marihuana in the 1930s,” *Pharmacy in History* 14, no. 1 (1972): 25–35.

13. Rubin, *Cannabis and Culture*, 3–4.

14. Ernest L. Abel, *Marijuana: The First Twelve Thousand Years* (New York: Springer 1980), ix–xi, 270–271. Much the same can be said of Larry Sloman’s *Reefer Madness: A History of Marijuana* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1979).

15. Jack Herer, *The Emperor Has No Clothes* (Van Nuys, California: Ah Ha Publishing, 1985), 2–3.

16. Although oft-cited, these works are written from Western (particularly North American) perspectives, and tend to recycle myths, produce little new evidence, and rely on the reader’s sympathies for cannabis consumers and consumption. Martin Booth, *Cannabis: A History* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2004); Martin Lee, *Smoke Signals: A Social History of Marijuana—Medical, Recreational and Scientific* (New York: Scriber Book Company, 2013); and John Hudak, *Marijuana: A Short History* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2016).

17. Virginia Berridge, *Opium and the People: Opiate Use and Drug Control Policy in Nineteenth- and Early-Twentieth-Century England* (London: Free Association Press, 1999).

18. David F. Musto and Pamela Korsmeyer, *The Quest for Drug Control: Politics and Federal Policy in a Period of Increasing Substance Abuse, 1963–1981* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002); David F. Musto, *The American Disease: Origins of Narcotic Control* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999); David Courtwright, *Forces of Habit: Drugs and the Making of the Modern World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002); Carolyn Jean Acker, *Creating the American Junkie: Addiction Research in the Classic Era of Narcotic Control* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002). This raft of publications around the turn of the century stimulated later studies such as Kathleen Frydl, *The Drug Wars in America, 1940–1973* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); and Matthew Pembleton, *Containing Addiction: The Federal Bureau of Narcotics and the Origins of America’s Global Drug War* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2017).

19. William B. McAllister, *Drug Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2002).

20. Suzanne Taylor, “Re-Medicalizing Cannabis: Science, Medicine and Policy, 1973 to the Early Twenty-First Century” (PhD thesis, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, 2010).

21. John Jiggins, “Marijuana Australiana: Cannabis Use, Popular Culture, and the Americanisation of Drugs Policy in Australia, 1938–1988,” (PhD thesis, Queensland University of Technology, 2004).
22. Marcel Martel, *Not This Time: Canadians, Public Policy, and the Marijuana Question, 1961–1975* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2006); Catherine Carstairs, *Jailed for Possession: Illegal Drug Use, Regulation, and Power in Canada, 1920–1961* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 2006); Andrew Potter and Daniel M. Weinstock, eds., *The Legalization and Regulation of Cannabis in Canada* (Montreal: McGill Queen’s University Press, 2019).
23. Isaac Campos, *Home Grown: Marijuana and the Origins of Mexico’s War on Drugs* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).
24. Nick Johnson, *Grass Roots: A History of Cannabis in the American West* (Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 2017); Ryan Stoa’s recent book argues that there are ways to address the historical drift toward environmentally damaging practices in cannabis cultivation in the United States. See *Craft Weed: Family Farming and the Future of the Marijuana Industry* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2018).
25. Emily Dufton, *Grass Roots: The Rise and Fall and Rise of Marijuana in America* (New York: Basic Books, 2017).
26. Chris S. Duvall, *The African Roots of Cannabis* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019), 131; see also Bradley Borougerdi, *Commodifying Cannabis: A Cultural History of a Complex Plant in the Atlantic World* (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2018).
27. David A Guba Jr. review of *The African Roots of Cannabis*, by Chris S. Duvall, *Social History of Medicine* 24 (March 2020): <https://doi.org/10.1093/shm/hkaa030>.
28. Emmanuel Akyeampong, “Diaspora and Drug Trafficking in West Africa: A Case Study of Ghana,” *African Affairs* 104, no. 416 (July 2005): 429–447. For the conditions that encourage this, see Neil Carrier and Gernot Klantschnig, “Quasilegality: Khat, Cannabis and Africa’s Drug Laws,” *Third World Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (2018).
29. Gernot Klantschnig, “Histories of Cannabis Use and Control in Nigeria, 1927–1967,” in *Drugs in Africa*, ed. Gernot Klantschnig, Neil Carrier, and Charles Ambler (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 70.
30. Utathya Chattopadhyaya, “Dagga and Prohibition: Markets, Animals, and the Imperial Contexts of Knowledge, 1893–1925,” *South African Historical Journal* 71, no. 4 (2019): 587–613.
31. Peter Hanoomansingh, “Crown Colony and the Problem of Ganja in Nineteenth-Century Trinidad: A Sociology of Knowledge on Cannabis in Colonial Context” (PhD thesis, University of the West Indies, 2011).
32. James Tharin Bradford, *Poppies, Politics, and Power: Afghanistan and the Global History of Drugs and Diplomacy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2019).

33. David Guba, *Taming Cannabis: Drugs and Empire in Nineteenth-Century France* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2020); Haggai Ram, *Intoxicating Zion: A Social History of Hashish in Mandatory Palestine and Israel* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2020).
34. Paul Gootenberg, ed., *Cocaine: Global Histories* (New York: Routledge, 1999).
35. Maziyar Ghiabi, "Spirit and Being: Interdisciplinary Reflections on Drugs Across History and Politics," *Third World Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (2018): 207–217, quote on 207.
36. UNODC, *World Drug Report 2019* (Vienna: UN Publication, 2019), 7.
37. Vera Rubin, ed., *Cannabis and Culture* (Berlin: De Gruyter: Mouton, 1975), 3.
38. James H. Mills, *Cannabis Nation: Control and Consumption in Britain, 1928–2008* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 116–154.
39. This is quoted from chapter 9 of this volume "Hashers Don't Read *Das Kaptial*" (p. 212).
40. This is quoted from chapter 11 of this volume "Cannabis, Counterculture, and Criminals" (p. 248).
41. See Lina Britto, *Marijuana Boom: The Rise and Fall of Colombia's First Drug Paradise* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2020) for a similar argument about cannabis, cocaine and Colombia's ties with the US market in the 1960s.
42. Lynn Hunt, *Writing History in the Global Era* (New York and London: W.W. Norton & Co., 2014), 52–59. She argues that this point occurred in the 1990s. See also Simon J. Potter and Jonathan Saha, "Global History, Imperial History and Connected Histories of Empire," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 16, no. 1 (2015).
43. See Benjamin Breen, *The Age of Intoxication: The Origins of the Global Drug Trade* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019); see also Jordan Goodman, Andrew Sherratt, Paul E. Lovejoy, eds., *Consuming Habits: Drugs in History and Anthropology*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2007).
44. A number of recent studies are useful in helping to understand such processes. See Paula De Vos, *Compound Remedies: Galenic Pharmacy from the Ancient Mediterranean to New Spain* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2020); Matthew Crawford and Joseph Gabriel, eds., *Drugs on the Page: Pharmacopoeias and Healing Knowledge in the Early Modern Atlantic World* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2019); and Pablo Gomez, *The Experiential Caribbean: Creating Knowledge and Healing in the Early Modern Atlantic* (University of North Carolina Press, 2018).
45. Isa Blumi, *Ottoman Refugees, 1878–1939: Migration in a Post-imperial World* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013).
46. Blanca Sánchez-Alonso, "The Age of Mass Migration in Latin America," in *The Economic History Review* 72 (2019): 3–31.

47. Simon J. Potter and Jonathan Saha, "Global History, Imperial History and Connected Histories of Empire," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 16, no. 1 (2015).

48. "UN Agency Removes Cannabis from Strictest Drug Category," *Washington Post*, December 2, 2020, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/un-agency-removes-cannabis-from-strictest-drug-category/2020/12/02/6037f988-34c4-11eb-9699-00d311f13d2d_story.html; "Reefer gladness as UN reclassifies cannabis as less dangerous drug," *The Guardian*, December 2, 2020, <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2020/dec/02/reefer-gladness-as-un-reclassifies-cannabis-as-less-dangerous-drug>.

49. Max Daly, "UN Recognises Medicinal Properties of Cannabis in Historic Vote," *Vice*, December 2, 2020, <https://www.vice.com/en/article/93w39d/cannabis-is-officially-a-medicine-following-historic-un-vote>; and Bill Chappell, "U.N. Commission Removes Cannabis From Its Most Strict Drug Control List," NPR News, December 2, 2020, <https://www.npr.org/2020/12/02/941283185/u-n-commission-removes-cannabis-from-its-most-strict-drug-control-list>.

50. "Dropping out" is a popular phrase attributed to Timothy Leary. See Scott Staton, "Turn On, Tune In, Drop by the Archives: Timothy Leary at the N.Y.P.L.," *The New Yorker*, June 16, 2011, <https://www.newyorker.com/books/page-turner/turn-on-tune-in-drop-by-the-archives-timothy-leary-at-the-n-y-p-l>.

51. Lina Britto, *Marijuana Boom: The Rise and Fall of Colombia's First Drug Paradise* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2020).

52. See David Herzberg, *White Market Drugs: Big Pharma and the Hidden History of Drug Addiction in America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020), among others, for a discussion of the false dichotomy between "drugs" and "medicines"; there is also a developing literature related to "medical tourism" and substances, particularly with respect to psychedelics and Indigenous practices and rituals.

53. As this introduction was being finalized in December 2020, a cannabis decriminalization bill was passed in the US House of Representatives. See "US House Passes Federal Cannabis Decriminalisation Bill," *BBC News*, December 4, 2020, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-55191808>, and Caitlin McFall, "GOP leaders lay into Pelosi for marijuana legalization bill while COVID-19 relief remains uncertain," *Fox News*, December 3, 2020, <https://www.foxnews.com/politics/gop-leaders-lay-into-pelosi-for-marijuana-legalization-bill-while-covid-relief-remains-uncertain>. At time of this volume going to press, Mexico's Chamber of Deputies voted in favor of a bill to legalize cannabis for recreational use; Tal Axelrod, "Mexico Lawmakers Approve Bill to Legalize Recreational Marijuana," *The Hill*, March 11, 2021, <https://thehill.com/policy/international/542710-mexico-lawmakers-approve-bill-to-legalize-recreational-marijuana>.

54. Emily Ledger, "Medical CBD Facility Opens Backed by British and Lesotho Company Partnership," August 8, 2019, <https://canex.co.uk/medical-cbd-facility-opens-backed-by-british-and-lesotho-company-partnership/>.

55. Katrin Magnussen, Eoin Keenan, Alexandra Curley, Stephen Murphy, "The LATAM Cannabis Report," October 2018 (London: Prohibition Partners, 2018), 9.

56. See Michelle Newhart, William Dolphin, *The Medicalization of Marijuana: Legitimacy, Stigma, and the Patient Experience* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018); Kenneth Finn, ed., *Cannabis in Medicine: An Evidence-Based Approach* (Springer Publishing, 2020).